

**2008/52**



Estimating the dynamics  
of R&D-based growth models

Yuri Yatsenko, Raouf Boucekkine  
and Natali Hritonenko

**CORE**

Voie du Roman Pays 34

B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

Tel (32 10) 47 43 04

Fax (32 10) 47 43 01

E-mail: [corestat-library@uclouvain.be](mailto:corestat-library@uclouvain.be)

<http://www.uclouvain.be/en-44508.html>

CORE DISCUSSION PAPER  
2008/52

**Estimating the dynamics of R&D-based growth models**

Yuri YATSENKO<sup>1</sup>, Raouf BOUCEKKINE<sup>2</sup>  
and Natali HRITONENKO<sup>3</sup>

September 2008

**Abstract**

Several R&D-based models of endogenous economic growth are investigated under the Solow-like assumption of fixed allocation of resources across activities. We identify model parameters that lead to explosive dynamics and analyze various economic techniques to avoid it. The techniques include adding stricter constraints on model trajectories and limiting factors in technology equation. In particular, we demonstrate that our vintage version of the well-known R&D-based model of economic growth (Jones, 1995) exhibits the same balanced dynamics as the original model.

**Keywords:** vintage capital models, endogenous technological change, R&D investment, explosive dynamics, nonlinear Volterra integral equations.

**JEL Classification:** E20, O40, C60

---

<sup>1</sup> College of Business & Economics, Houston Baptist University, Texas, USA. E-mail: [yyatsenko@hbu.edu](mailto:yyatsenko@hbu.edu)

<sup>2</sup> CORE, Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium and University of Glasgow, UK. E-mail: [raouf.boucekkine@uclouvain.be](mailto:raouf.boucekkine@uclouvain.be). This author is also member of ECORE, the newly created association between CORE and ECARES.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Mathematics, Prairie View A&M University, Texas, USA. E-mail: [nahritonenko@pvamu.edu](mailto:nahritonenko@pvamu.edu)

This paper was partly written when Yuri Yatsenko was visiting CORE. An early version was presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Nonlinear Analysts WCNA-2008 held in Orlando (Florida USA). Boucekkine acknowledges financial support of the Belgian research programmes, PAI P4/01 and ARC 03/08-302..

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Program on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction initiated by the Belgian State, Prime Minister's Office, Science Policy Programming. The scientific responsibility is assumed by the authors.



## 1. Introduction

Explosive dynamics occurs in nonlinear dynamic models when model trajectories become unbounded in a finite time [4, 10]. Such behavior is natural in some physical areas such as combustion theory but should be avoided in economic applications.

We analyze the possibility of explosive dynamics in R&D-based models of endogenous economic growth described by nonlinear Volterra integral equations. The models of endogenous growth assume that a certain part of the product output is spent on science and technology needs and positively impacts the efficiency (productivity) of the economic system under study [1,3,5]. This impact is usually referred to as *endogenous technological change* (TC). From the system-theoretic viewpoint, it represents a nonlinear *positive feedback* in the corresponding dynamic system. Systems with positive feedback can explode at finite time, which makes the fundamental economic concept of discounted infinite-horizon optimization unworkable. The goal of this paper is to analyze model parameters that lead to explosive dynamics (blow-up solutions) and analytically compare different economic assumptions for avoiding explosive dynamics.

Models with endogenous TC have been explored by many authors. They contain various assumptions that prevent the explosive growth of the models. An analysis of these assumptions is important for understanding underlying dynamic features of the process under study. One of the most famous is the Romer model of endogenous TC [9], which includes a restricted non-renewable resource and produces a sustainable exponential balanced growth for any R&D efficiency. Another celebrated model with endogenous TC is the Jones model [8]. It does not involve non-renewable resource but its equation for technological growth includes a limited renewable resource (R&D labour).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes a R&D-based model with endogenous TC, vintage structure of capital, and endogenous scrapping of obsolete capital. Section 3 shows that the model can possess explosive, exponential, or less than exponential dynamics depending on a key relation between the R&D efficiency and complexity. Section 4 introduces some stricter

constraints on model functions and illustrates that such small modification eliminates the explosive growth. Section 5 introduces another modified model which is a vintage version of the Jones model. It demonstrates that the explosive growth is absent and the balanced dynamics is the same as in the original Jones model. Section 6 concludes the paper. Section 7 (Appendix) contains auxiliary mathematical results.

## 2. A vintage model with nonlinear R&D efficiency and R&D complexity.

We analyze the possibility of explosive dynamics in the nonlinear integral dynamic model with endogenous delay

$$Q(t) = \int_{a(t)}^t \beta(\tau) m(\tau) d\tau, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\beta'(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)} = \frac{f(R(\tau))}{\beta^d(\tau)}, \quad d \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

$$E(t) = \int_{a(t)}^t m(\tau) d\tau, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (3)$$

where the inputs  $m$ ,  $a$ ,  $R$  and outputs  $\beta$ ,  $Q$ , and  $E$  are unknown and satisfy the constraints

$$R(t) \geq 0, \quad m(t) \geq 0, \quad a_0 \leq a(t) < t, \quad (4)$$

$$c(t) = Q(t) - p(t)E(t) - R(t) - k(t)m(t) \geq 0, \quad (5)$$

$$E(t) \leq E_{\max}(t), \quad (6)$$

and the initial conditions:

$$\beta(-a_0) = \beta_0, \quad a(0) = a_0 < 0, \quad m(\tau) \equiv m_0(\tau), \quad R(\tau) \equiv R_0(\tau), \quad \tau \in [-a_0, 0]. \quad (7)$$

The nonlinear ODE (2) can be replaced with its solution

$$\beta(\tau) = \begin{cases} \left( d \int_0^\tau f(R(v)) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} & \text{at } d > 0, \\ B e^{\int_0^\tau f(R(v)) dv^{1/d}} & \text{at } d = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where the constant  $B=\beta_0(0)$  is uniquely determined by the initial conditions (7),

$$B = \begin{cases} \left( d \int_{a_0}^0 f(R_0(v)) dv + \beta_0^d \right)^{1/d} & \text{at } d > 0, \\ \beta_0 \exp\left( \int_{a_0}^0 f(R_0(v)) dv \right) & \text{at } d = 0. \end{cases}$$

The model (1)-(8) has important interpretation in the economic growth theory as the model of a firm with vintage capital and R&D-based endogenous TC [1]. Then,  $m(t)$  is the investment into new capital (measured in the resource consumption units),  $t-a(t)$  is the lifetime of capital,  $R(t)$  is the investment into science and technology (R&D investment),  $\beta(\tau)$  is the productivity,  $Q(t)$  is the total product output at  $t$ ,  $E(t)$  is a resource (labour, energy, environment contamination, etc.),  $c(t)$  is the net profit,  $k(t)$  is the unit capital price,  $p(t)$  is the resource price,  $E_{\max}(t)$  is the total available resource.  $E(t)$  is restricted by (6), where the regulation function  $E_{\max}(t)$  is given.

The technology equation (2) includes the increasing concave function  $f(R)$ ,  $df/dR > 0$ ,  $d^2f/dR^2 < 0$ , that reflects the technological development as the nonlinear positive impact of the R&D investment  $R$  on productivity  $\beta$ . It also contains the factor  $\beta^{-d}(\tau)$  that describes the negative impact of the “R&D complexity”. Below we restrict ourselves with the benchmark case of

$$f(R) = bR^n, \quad 0 < n \leq 1, \quad b > 0, \quad (9)$$

where  $n$  is the parameter of R&D efficiency.

### 3. Estimating the Dynamics

Vintage models with the *exogenous* TC usually assume exponential productivity  $\beta(t)$  and deliver an exponential growth of the output  $Q$  [2, 6, 7]. The situation is completely different in the case of the model (1)-(9) with the *endogenous* TC. In this model, the relation between the parameters  $n$  and  $d$  of R&D efficiency and complexity plays the key role. The growth can be explosive, exponential, or less than exponential depending on this relation.

The technique employed in this paper is to estimate the asymptotics of the model (1)-(9) outputs for some reasonable “balanced” input trajectories. As it will be clear hereafter, this amounts to assuming a fixed allocation of resources across activities, mimicking the constant saving rate assumption in the Solow-like models. To do that, we derive simplified equations for asymptotic output trajectories at large  $t$  and find their exact solutions.

To better illustrate our technique, let us restrict ourselves with the special case:

$$E_{\max}(t)=E=\text{const}, \quad p(t)=p=\text{const}, \quad k(t)=k=\text{const}, \quad (10)$$

$$m_0(\tau)=m_0=\text{const}, \quad R_0(\tau)=0. \quad (11)$$

Condition (10) allows to work under a stationary environment (fixed quotas and prices).

Condition (11) selects a particular initial profile for investment in order to simplify the algebra.

The given parameters have to meet certain restrictions to satisfy the initial conditions (7). Let

$$p < \beta_0, \quad k < (\beta_0 - p)a_0/\beta_0. \quad (12)$$

Then  $c(0) = Q(0) - p(0)E(0) - R(0) - k(0)\beta(0)m_0(0) = Bm_0a_0 - pm_0a_0 - k\beta_0m_0 \geq 0$  at  $t=0$ .

### 3.1. The model with no R&D complexity ( $d=0$ ).

In the case  $d=0$ , the model dynamics is always explosive.

**Theorem 1.** *Let (10) -(12) hold. At  $d=0$  and any  $0 < n \leq 1$ , the dynamics of the model (1)-(9) is explosive:  $Q(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $R(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\beta(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c(t) \rightarrow \infty$  at  $t \rightarrow t_{cr}$  where  $t_{cr} > 0$  is a finite instant.*

**Proof.** Let us start with a simpler case first.

*Case  $n=1$  (linear  $f(R)=bR$ ).* Let us introduce the function:

$$\hat{Q}(t) = Q(t) - p(t)E(t) \quad (13)$$

and choose the following balanced trajectories

$$m(t)=s\hat{Q}(t), \quad R(t)=q\hat{Q}(t), \quad s, q=\text{const}>0, \quad s+q<1, \quad E(t)=E=\text{const}. \quad (14)$$



Assumption (14) mimics the famous Solow working assumption of constant saving rates.

Then, by (1) and (3),

$$\hat{Q}(t) = Bs \int_{a(t)}^t e^{-bq \int_0^\tau \hat{Q}(v) dv} \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau - pE, \quad (15)$$

and, by (10),

$$E = s \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau. \quad (16)$$

The system of two nonlinear integral equations (15) and (16) in  $\hat{Q}$  and  $a$  can be reduced to one equation with respect to  $\hat{Q}$ . Indeed, differentiating (15) and (16) leads to

$$\hat{Q}'(t) = Bse^{-bq \int_0^t \hat{Q}(v) dv} \hat{Q}(t) - Bse^{-bq \int_0^{a(t)} \hat{Q}(v) dv} \hat{Q}(a(t))a'(t),$$

$$\hat{Q}(t) = \hat{Q}(a(t))a'(t),$$

or 
$$\hat{Q}'(t) = Bse^{-bq \int_0^t \hat{Q}(v) dv} [1 - e^{-bq \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(v) dv}] \hat{Q}(t),$$

or, using (16) again,

$$\hat{Q}'(t) = Bs[1 - e^{-bqE/s}]e^{-bq \int_0^t \hat{Q}(v) dv} \hat{Q}(t). \quad (17)$$

The nonlinear equation (17) has a solution  $\hat{Q}(t)$  on some interval  $[0, t_{cr})$  (see, e.g. [4]). By (10)-(11),  $\hat{Q}'(t) > \text{const} > 0$ , hence  $\hat{Q}(t)$  increases. Let us estimate its growth order. Applying the integral mean value theorem to (15), we obtain

$$\hat{Q}(t) = Be^{-bq \int_0^{\xi(t)} \hat{Q}(v) dv} \int_{a(t)}^t m(\tau) d\tau - pE = (Be^{-bq \int_0^{\xi(t)} \hat{Q}(v) dv} - p)E, \quad (18)$$

where  $a(t) < \xi(t) < t$ . Let us estimate the function  $\xi(t)$ . Differentiating (16), we get  $a'(t) = \hat{Q}(t)/\hat{Q}(a(t)) > 1$ , hence,  $a(t)$  increases faster than  $t$ . Since  $a(t) < t$ ,  $t - a(t)$  decreases. When

$\hat{Q}(t) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $a(t) \rightarrow t$  by (16) and, hence,  $\xi(t) \rightarrow t$  in (18). It means that<sup>‡</sup>

$\hat{Q}(t) \sim BEe^{bq \int_0^t \hat{Q}(v) dv}$  for large  $\hat{Q}(t)$  and we can use the nonlinear integral equation

$$\hat{Q}(t) = BEe^{bq \int_0^t \hat{Q}(v) dv}, \quad t > 0, \quad (19)$$

to analyze the asymptotic of  $\hat{Q}(t)$ . Applying Lemma 1 (see Appendix) at  $n=1$  to (19), we obtain that  $\hat{Q}(t) \rightarrow \infty$  and, correspondingly,  $c(t) = (1-s-q)\hat{Q}(t) \rightarrow \infty$  at  $t \rightarrow 1/(bqBE)$ .

*Case of the nonlinear concave  $f(R) = bR^n$ ,  $0 < n < 1$ .* Let the trajectories  $m$  and  $R$  be the same as (14) above. Then,

$$\hat{Q}(t) = B \int_{a(t)}^t e^{bq^n \int_0^\tau \hat{Q}^n(v) dv} m(\tau) d\tau - pE, \quad (20)$$

and applying the mean value theorem to (20), we obtain the nonlinear integral equation

$$\hat{Q}(t) = BEe^{bq^n \int_0^t \hat{Q}^n(v) dv}, \quad t > 0, \quad (21)$$

to analyze the growth order of  $\hat{Q}(t)$ . By Lemma 1, the solution of (21) is

$$\hat{Q}(t) = (B^{-n}E^{-n} - bq^n t)^{-1/n}, \quad t \in [0, \frac{1}{B^n E^n bq^n}). \quad (22)$$

Hence, the  $\hat{Q}(t)$  growth is explosive on a finite interval for any  $0 < n < 1$ . The existence interval for

$\hat{Q}(t)$  is larger when the value  $n$  is smaller. The theorem is proved.  $\square$

**Remark.** To understand the reasons of explosive dynamics in equation (22), let us differentiate it and rewrite as

$$d\hat{Q}(t)/dt = F(\hat{Q})\hat{Q}(t), \quad F(\hat{Q}) = BEbq^n \hat{Q}^{n-1}(t) e^{bq^n \int_0^t \hat{Q}^n(v) dv} \quad (23)$$

---

<sup>‡</sup>  $x(t) \sim y(t)$  means that  $x(t)/y(t) \rightarrow \text{const} \neq 0$  at  $x(t) \rightarrow \infty$ .

The meaning of functional  $F(\hat{Q})$  is the specific productivity or the return per the unit of  $\hat{Q}$ . It increases *indefinitely* in  $\hat{Q}$ , so the dynamic system (23) has a *nonlinear positive feedback*: when  $\hat{Q}(t)$  increases, then  $F(\hat{Q})$  increases and leads to a faster increase of  $\hat{Q}(t)$  later. Systems with a positive feedback can explode at finite time as opposed to the systems with a limited growth rate  $F(\hat{Q})$ . So, we need to restrict the feedback in order to analyze the system on the infinite horizon.

### 3.2. Model with R&D complexity ( $d > 0$ ).

If the R&D complexity parameter  $d > 0$ , then the relation between  $n$  and  $d$  appears to be important.

**Theorem 2.** *Let (10)-(12) hold. Then:*

(1) *At  $n > d$ , the model (1)-(9) leads to the explosive growth  $Q(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $R(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c(t) \rightarrow \infty$  at a finite instant  $t_{cr} > 0$ .*

(2) *At  $d = n$ , the solution  $Q(t)$ ,  $R(t)$ ,  $c(t)$  of the model (1)-(9) can grow exponentially as  $e^{Ct}$ , where the maximum possible rate  $C > 0$  is determined by the given values  $E_0$ ,  $b$ , and  $d$ .*

(3) *At  $d > n$ , the possible growth of the solution  $Q(t)$ ,  $R(t)$ ,  $c(t)$  of the model (1)-(9) is described by the power function  $t^{1/(d-n)}$ .*

**Proof** follows the technique of Theorem 1. Choosing the same balanced inputs  $m$  and  $R$  as in (14), we obtain the system of two integral equations

$$\hat{Q}(t) = s \int_{a(t)}^t \left( d \int_0^\tau f(R(v)) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau - pE, \quad (24)$$

$$E = s \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau \quad (25)$$

for  $\hat{Q}$  and  $a$ . Assuming that the solution  $\hat{Q}$  grows, we estimate its growth order. Applying the integral mean value theorem to (24) and using (25), we obtain

$$\hat{Q}(t) = s \left( d \int_0^{\xi(t)} f(R(v)) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau - pE = \left[ s \left( d \int_0^{\xi(t)} f(R(v)) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} - p \right] E$$

,

where  $a(t) < \xi(t) < t$ ,  $a(t) \rightarrow t$ ,  $\xi(t) \rightarrow t$ . Hence,  $\hat{Q}(t) \sim E \left( dbq^n \int_0^t \hat{Q}^n(v) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d}$  for  $\hat{Q}(t) \gg 1$

and we can use the nonlinear integral equation

$$\hat{Q}^d(t) = E^d dbq^n \int_0^t \hat{Q}^n(v) dv + B^d, \quad t > 0, \quad (26)$$

to analyze the asymptotic of  $\hat{Q}(t)$ . Applying Lemma 2 from Appendix to (26), we prove the theorem.  $\square$

Mathematically, the qualitative behaviour of model trajectories is similar to the simpler nonlinear ODE

$$dx/dt = cx^{n-d+1}(t), \quad n > 0, \quad d > 0, \quad x(0) = x_0 > 0, \quad (27)$$

The rate  $F(x) = cx^{n-d}$  in (27) increases *indefinitely* in  $x$  at  $n > d$ , which leads to the explosive solution

$$x(t) = (x_0^{-(n-d)} - (n-d)ct)^{-1/(n-d)}, \quad t \in [0, \frac{1}{(n-d)cx_0^n}). \quad \text{If } n < d, \text{ then } t_{cr} = (ncx_0^n)^{-1} > 1.$$

The solution of (27) is an exponent at  $n=d$  and is a power function at  $n < d$ .

### 3.3. Model without resource constraint.

The resource constraint (6) plays an essential stabilizing role in the model (1)-(9). If we remove this constraint, then the growth is *explosive for any parameters*  $n$  and  $d$  of R&D efficiency and complexity. Namely,

**Theorem 3.** *Let (10) - (12) hold. At any  $n > 0$  and  $d > 0$ , the dynamics of the model (1)-(5), (7)-(9) is always explosive:  $Q(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $R(t) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c(t) \rightarrow \infty$  at  $t \rightarrow t_{cr}$  where  $t_{cr} > 0$  is a finite instant.*

**Proof.** We consider the same trajectories  $R$  and  $m$  as in (14) and  $a \equiv 0$ . Then, analogously to (24), we obtain the equation

$$\hat{Q}(t) = s \int_0^t \left( d \int_0^\tau f(R(v)) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau - pE \quad (28)$$

with respect to  $\hat{Q}$  (as opposed to the previous case,  $a=0$  and there is no restriction (25)).

Assuming that the solution  $\hat{Q}$  of (28) grows, we can estimate its growth order. After double differentiation and other transformations, we obtain the nonlinear differential equation

$$d^2 y(t)/dt^2 = K e^{ny/d}, \quad K = bdq^n s^d > 0, \quad (29)$$

to analyze the growth order of  $y(t) = \ln \hat{Q}(t)$ . One can see that the solution (29) is explosive, which proves the theorem.  $\square$

Therefore, if R&D investments can increase the productivity indefinitely in accordance with (2) and resources are unlimited, then the economic growth in model (1)-(5),(7)-(9) is explosive.

#### 4. Dynamics of modified model with cost-saving TC.

Let us consider the modified model (1)-(9) where the constraint (5) is replaced with

$$c(t) = Q(t) - p(t)E(t) - R(t) - k(t)\beta(t)m(t) \geq 0, \quad (30)$$

and all other model expressions (1)-(4), (6)-(9) remain the same. The meaning of this modification is increasing the investment expense part of the net profit  $c(t)$ , making it proportional to the productivity growth  $\beta(t)$ . One of the specific interpretations of (30) is changing the way of how the *endogenous TC* is described: from the *output-increasing TC* in the model (1)-(9) to the *cost-saving TC* in the model (1)-(4),(6)-(9),(30) as in most related papers (see [1] for details).

The modification produces a stabilizing effect on model dynamics. In the modified model (1)-(4),(6)-(9),(30), the case of *explosive dynamics appears to be impossible* because of the stabilizing role of the constraint  $c(t) \geq 0$ . However, the relation between  $n$  and  $d$  is still important.

**Theorem 4.** Let (10)-(12) hold. Then, at  $n \geq d$ , the solution  $Q(t)$ ,  $R(t)$ ,  $c(t)$  of the model (1)-(4), (6)-(9), (30) can grow exponentially. At  $n < d$ , the possible growth of the solution  $Q(t)$ ,  $R(t)$ ,  $c(t)$  is described by the power function  $t^{1/(d-n)}$ .

**Proof.** Let us choose the following balanced trajectories

$$\beta(t)m(t)=s\hat{Q}(t), \quad R(t)=q\hat{Q}(t), \quad s, q=\text{const}>0, \quad q+ks < 1-p/\beta_0, \quad (31)$$

Because of the modified constraint  $c(t) \geq 0$  in (30), we can not choose  $m(t)=s\hat{Q}(t)$  as in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. As we will see, it makes explosive dynamics impossible in this model. Then, by (1), (3), and (13),

$$\hat{Q}(t) = s \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau - pE, \quad (32)$$

$$\text{by (9),} \quad \beta(\tau) = \left( dbq^n \int_0^\tau \hat{Q}^n(v) dv + B^d \right)^{1/d} \quad (33)$$

and, by (3),

$$E = s \int_{a(t)}^t \frac{\hat{Q}(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)} d\tau = s \int_{a(t)}^t \hat{Q}(\tau) \left( dbq^n \int_0^\tau \hat{Q}^n(v) dv + B^d \right)^{-1/d} d\tau. \quad (34)$$

Assuming that  $\hat{Q}$  grows, we estimate its growth order. First of all,  $a(t) \geq -a_0$  by (4), hence,  $\hat{Q}(t)$

satisfies the integral inequality  $\hat{Q}(t) \leq s \int_0^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau + C_0$  and  $\hat{Q}(t) \leq C_0 \exp(st)$  by the Gronwall-

Bellman lemma.

*Case  $n \geq d$ .* Let us assume that  $\hat{Q}(t) \sim \exp(Ct)$  for some  $C > 0$ . Then,  $\beta(t) \sim \exp(Cnt/d)$  by (33) and, by (14),  $m(t)=s\hat{Q}(t)/\beta(t) \sim \exp(C(1-n/d)t)$  does not increase at  $n=d$  and decreases exponentially at  $n > d$ . Let us estimate the behaviour of function  $a(t)$ . Differentiating (34), we get

$$a'(t) = m(t)/m(a(t)) = \exp[C(1-n/d)(t-a(t))] \leq 1,$$

hence,  $a(t) \leq t - a_0 = t - E/m_0$ .

Differentiating (32), we obtain

$$d\hat{Q}(t)/dt = s\hat{Q}(t) - s\hat{Q}(a(t))da/dt, \quad (35)$$

If  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $d\hat{Q}(t)/dt \rightarrow s_1\hat{Q}(t)$ , where  $s_1=s$  at  $n>d$  and  $s_1=s[1-\exp(-E/m_0)]$  at  $n=d$ . So, we can use the linear ODE  $d\hat{Q}(t)/dt = s_1\hat{Q}(t)$  to analyze the growth order of  $\hat{Q}(t)$  when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

Therefore,  $\hat{Q}(t) \sim \exp(s_1 t)$  is an exponent indeed.

The proof of case  $n < d$  is identical to Theorem 3. Theorem is proved.  $\square$

Thus, the model (1)-(4),(6)-(9),(30) does not have explosive dynamics in all cases  $n > d$ ,  $n = d$  and  $n < d$ .

Theorems 1-4 remain valid if the given functions  $p$  and  $E$  increase exponentially (slower than  $Q$  to keep (5) positive).

As in Section 3.3, let us eliminate constraint  $E(t) \leq E_m(t)$  and consider the *model without the resource constraint*. Then the growth is *exponential for any parameters*  $n$  and  $d$  of R&D efficiency and complexity. To prove that fact, we consider the same trajectories (14) and  $a(t) \equiv a_0$ . Then, analogously to (32), we obtain the following linear Volterra equation

$$\hat{Q}(t) = s \int_0^t \hat{Q}(\tau) d\tau + \int_{-a_0}^0 \beta_0(\tau) m_0(\tau) d\tau - pE$$

with respect to  $\hat{Q}$ . Its solution is  $\hat{Q}(t) \sim \exp(st)$ .

Therefore, if the resources are unlimited, then the economic growth in the model (1)-(4),(6)-(9),(30) with the energy-saving TC is always exponential (under non-zero R&D investments).

## 5. Vintage model with endogenous TC à la Jones.

Let us introduce the following nonlinear dynamic model:

$$Q(t) = \int_{a(t)}^t [\beta(\tau) L_Q(\tau)]^\alpha m^{1-\alpha}(\tau) d\tau, \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{\beta'(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)} = \frac{bL_{\beta}^n(\tau)}{\beta^d(\tau)}, \quad n > 0, d > 0, \quad (37)$$

$$Q(t) = m(t) + C(t), \quad (38)$$

$$L_Q(t) + L_{\beta}(t) = L(t) = L_0 e^{lt}, \quad (39)$$

where the inputs  $m$ ,  $a$ ,  $L_{\beta}$  and outputs  $Q$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $C$  are unknown.

The model (36)-(39) is a vintage version of the well-known Jones model with endogenous TC [8]. For consistency sake, we keep the notations similar to our previous model (1)-(9) wherever possible. The differences between the models ((1)-(9) and (36)-(39) are:

- the output equation (36) involves the two-factor Cobb-Douglas production function,
- the given labour resource  $L$  is separated into the production labour  $L_Q$  and the R&D labour  $L_{\beta}$ ,
- the limiting labour factor  $L_{\beta}$  is introduced into the technology equation (37).

As opposed to the Jones model, we keep the vintage structure of capital with endogenous capital scrapping. Jones [8] considers the maximization of utility functional

$\max_{m,a,R} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-rt} u(C(t)/L(t)) dt$  and shows that such optimization leads to an exponential balanced growth path.

Let us investigate the dynamics of balanced growth in the model (36)-(39). As in [8], we choose the exponential trajectories

$$Q(t)=Q_0 \exp(st), \quad C(t)=C_0 \exp(st), \quad m(t)=m_0 \exp(st), \quad L(t)=L_{\beta 0} \exp(lt), \quad L_{\beta 0} < L_0,$$

where  $s$  is to be determined. The substitution of these trajectories into the technology equation (37) leads to  $\beta'(t)=b L_{\beta 0} e^{nlt} \beta^{d-1}(t)$ , whose exact solution is

$$\beta(t) = \left[ \frac{bL_{\beta 0}}{nl} \right]^{\frac{1}{d}} e^{\frac{nl}{d}t} + \text{const}_1 \quad (40)$$



Next, substituting (40) into the output equation (36) leads to

$$Q_0 e^{st} \cong \text{const}_2 \int_{a(t)}^t e^{nl\alpha\tau/d} e^{l\alpha\tau} e^{s(1-\alpha)\tau} d\tau. \quad (41)$$

The natural choice of a balanced growth  $a(t)$  is  $a(t)=t-\text{const}$  [1]. It is easy to see, that substituting  $a(t)=t-\text{const}$  or  $a(t)=0$  into (41), we obtain the same balanced growth rate

$$s = l(n/d + 1)$$

In particular, the balanced *per capita consumption*  $c(t) = C(t)/L(t) = e^{nl/d}$  has the same rate that in the Jones original (non-vintage) model [8]. So, the dynamics of the model (36)-(39) is exponential at  $d>0$  and is explosive at  $d=0$ .

## 6. Conclusions

1. The explosive dynamics routinely appears in the endogenous growth model (1)-(9), even when the technology equation (2) includes a saturation effect represented by concave  $f(R)=bR^n$ ,  $n<1$ ). It is always the case in the model without R&D complexity (at  $d=0$ ). In the model with R&D complexity ( $d>0$ ), the growth can be explosive, exponential, or less than exponential depending on the relation between the parameters  $n$  and  $d$  of R&D efficiency and complexity. If we remove the resource constraint (6) from the model, then the growth is *always explosive* (for any parameters  $n$  and  $d$ ).

2. The explosive dynamics is *impossible* in the modified model with cost-saving endogenous TC of Section 4, which is achieved via increasing the investment expense part in the net profit  $c(t)$ . The technology equation (2) remains the same.

3. Another way to avoid the explosive dynamics was implemented in the well-known endogenous growth models of Romer [9] and Jones [8]. The major difference between our models (1)-(9) and the Jones model is in the technology equation: instead of the part  $R$  of output  $Q$ , the new technology equation (37) now uses of the part  $L_\beta$  of the total labour resource  $L$  to

control the efficiency  $\beta$ . The unknown  $L_\beta$  cannot grow faster than the total labour  $L$ . From system-theoretical viewpoint, the technology equation (37) in Jones model possesses a *nonlinear negative feedback* (rather the positive one as in our technology equation (2)). Indeed, presenting (37) as  $d\beta/dt = F(\beta, t)\beta$ , we can see that the growth rate  $F(\beta, t) = L_\beta^n(t)\beta^{d-1}$  can increase indefinitely in  $t$  because of exponential  $L_\beta(t)$ , but it decreases, when the productivity  $\beta$  increases. So, as usually in the system theory, a negative feedback stabilizes dynamic system.

Both approaches have their pros and cons. The control  $R$  in our model (1)-(9) seems to be too powerful and can lead to the explosive dynamics. In contrary, the control  $L_\beta$  in the model (36)-(39) *à la* Jones is too weak. In particular, there is no asymptotic growth at all if the total labour is constant.

## 7. Appendix.

**Lemma 1.** *The nonlinear Volterra integral equation of the second kind*

$$x(t) = Ce^{\alpha \int_0^t x^n(v) dv}, \quad 0 < n \leq 1, \quad C > 0, \quad \alpha > 0, \quad (42)$$

has the unique solution  $x(t) = \frac{1}{(C^{-n} - \alpha n t)^{1/n}}, \quad t \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha n C^n})$ .

**Proof** is provided by the substitution of solution  $x(t)$  into (42). Namely, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t x^n(v) dv &= \int_0^t \frac{1}{(C^{-n} - \alpha n v)^{1/n}} dv = -\frac{1}{\alpha n} \ln(C^{-n} - \alpha n t) + \frac{1}{\alpha n} \ln(C^{-n}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha n} \ln \frac{C^{-n}}{C^{-n} - \alpha n t} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln \frac{1}{C(C^{-n} - \alpha n t)^{1/n}} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the last formula into (42), we have the identity. Lemma is proved.

**Lemma 2.** *The nonlinear Volterra integral equation of the second kind*

$$x^d(t) = C \int_0^t x^n(v) dv + x_0^d, \quad 0 < n < 1, \quad C > 0, \quad d > 0, \quad (43)$$

has the unique solution:

$$\text{at } d < n: \quad x(t) = \frac{1}{(x_0^{-(n-d)} - C(n-d)t/d)^{1/(n-d)}}, \quad t \in [0, \frac{dx_0^{d-n}}{(n-d)C}). \quad (44)$$

$$\text{at } d > n: \quad x(t) = \left( \left( \frac{(d-n)C}{d} \right)^{1/(d-n)} t + x_0^{d-n} \right)^{1/(d-n)}, \quad t \in [0, \infty) \quad (45)$$

$$\text{at } d = n: \quad x(t) = x_0 e^{Ct/n}, \quad t \in [0, \infty). \quad (46)$$

Lemma 2 is also verified by substitution of (44)-(46) into (43).

## References

- [1] R. Boucekkine, N. Hritonenko, Yu. Yatsenko, Optimal firm behavior under environmental constraints, CORE Discussion Paper 2008/24, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, 2008.
- [2] R. Boucekkine, O. Licandro, C. Paul, Differential-difference equations in economics: On the numerical solution of vintage capital growth models, *J. Econ Dynamics and Control* 21 (1997) 347-362.
- [3] N. Hritonenko, Modeling of optimal investment in science and technology, *Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems Analysis* 2(2008), 220-230.
- [4] N. Hritonenko, Yu. Yatsenko, *Applied Mathematical Modeling of Engineering Problems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Massachusetts, 2003.
- [5] N. Hritonenko, Yu. Yatsenko, Mathematical Models of Global Trends and Technological Change, in *Mathematical Models*, [Ed. Jerzy A. Filar], in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*, Developed under the Auspices of the UNESCO, Oxford, UK, 2007, [<http://www.eolss.net>]
- [6] N. Hritonenko and Yu. Yatsenko, Optimal control of Solow vintage capital model with nonlinear utility, *Optimization* 57(2008) 581-590.
- [7] N. Hritonenko, Yu. Yatsenko, Turnpike properties of optimal delay in integral dynamic models, *J. Optimization Theory and Appl* 127 (2005) 109-127.
- [8] C.I. Jones, R&D-based models of economic growth *J Polit Econ* 103(1995) 759-784
- [9] P.M. Romer, Endogenous technological change, *J Polit Econ* 98(1990) 71-102
- [10] C.A. Roberts, D.G. Lasseigne, W.E. Olmstead, Volterra equations which models explosion in diffusive medium, *J Integral Equations and Appl.* 5(1993) 531-546.

## Recent titles

### CORE Discussion Papers

- 2008/15. Juan D. MORENO-TERNERO. Interdependent preferences in the design of equal-opportunity policies.
- 2008/16. Ana MAULEON, Vincent VANNETELBOSCH and Wouter VERGOTE. Von Neumann-Morgenstern farsightedly stable sets in two-sided matching.
- 2008/17. Tanguy ISAAC. Information revelation in markets with pairwise meetings: complete information revelation in dynamic analysis.
- 2008/18. Juan D. MORENO-TERNERO and John E. ROEMER. Axiomatic resource allocation for heterogeneous agents.
- 2008/19. Carlo CAPUANO and Giuseppe DE FEO. Mixed duopoly, privatization and the shadow cost of public funds.
- 2008/20. Helmuth CREMER, Philippe DE DONDER, Dario MALDONADO and Pierre PESTIEAU. Forced saving, redistribution and nonlinear social security schemes.
- 2008/21. Philippe CHEVALIER and Jean-Christophe VAN DEN SCHRIECK. Approximating multiple class queueing models with loss models.
- 2008/22. Pierre PESTIEAU and Uri M. POSSEN. Interaction of defined benefit pension plans and social security.
- 2008/23. Marco MARINUCCI. Optimal ownership in joint ventures with contributions of asymmetric partners.
- 2008/24. Raouf BOUCEKKINE, Natali HRITONENKO and Yuri YATSENKO. Optimal firm behavior under environmental constraints.
- 2008/25. Ana MAULEON, Vincent VANNETELBOSCH and Cecilia VERGARI. Market integration in network industries.
- 2008/26. Leonidas C. KOUTSOUGERAS and Nicholas ZIROS. Decentralization of the core through Nash equilibrium.
- 2008/27. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ, Didier LAUSSEL and Ornella TAROLA. To acquire, or to compete? An entry dilemma.
- 2008/28. Jean-Sébastien TRANCREZ, Philippe CHEVALIER and Pierre SEMAL. Probability masses fitting in the analysis of manufacturing flow lines.
- 2008/29. Marie-Louise LEROUX. Endogenous differential mortality, non monitored effort and optimal non linear taxation.
- 2008/30. Santanu S. DEY and Laurence A. WOLSEY. Two row mixed integer cuts via lifting.
- 2008/31. Helmuth CREMER, Philippe DE DONDER, Dario MALDONADO and Pierre PESTIEAU. Taxing sin goods and subsidizing health care.
- 2008/32. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ, Didier LAUSSEL and Nathalie SONNAC. The TV news scheduling game when the newscaster's face matters.
- 2008/33. Didier LAUSSEL and Joana RESENDE. Does the absence of competition *in* the market foster competition *for* the market? A dynamic approach to aftermarkets.
- 2008/34. Vincent D. BLONDEL and Yurii NESTEROV. Polynomial-time computation of the joint spectral radius for some sets of nonnegative matrices.
- 2008/35. David DE LA CROIX and Clara DELAVALLADE. Democracy, rule of law, corruption incentives and growth.
- 2008/36. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ and Joana RESENDE. Uncertain quality, product variety and price competition.
- 2008/37. Gregor ZOETTL. On investment decisions in liberalized electricity markets: the impact of price caps at the spot market.
- 2008/38. Helmuth CREMER, Philippe DE DONDER, Dario MALDONADO and Pierre PESTIEAU. Habit formation and labor supply.
- 2008/39. Marie-Louise LEROUX and Grégory PONTIERE. Optimal tax policy and expected longevity: a mean and variance approach.
- 2008/40. Kristian BEHRENS and Pierre M. PICARD. Transportation, freight rates, and economic geography.

## Recent titles

### CORE Discussion Papers - continued

- 2008/41. Gregor ZOETTL. Investment decisions in liberalized electricity markets: A framework of peak load pricing with strategic firms.
- 2008/42. Raouf BOUCEKKINE, Rodolphe DESBORDES and Hélène LATZER. How do epidemics induce behavioral changes?
- 2008/43. David DE LA CROIX and Marie VANDER DONCKT. Would empowering women initiate the demographic transition in least-developed countries?
- 2008/44. Geoffrey CARUSO, Dominique PEETERS, Jean CAVAILHES and Mark ROUNSEVELL. Space-time patterns of urban sprawl, a 1D cellular automata and microeconomic approach.
- 2008/45. Taoufik BOUEZMARNI, Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS and Abderrahim TAAMOUTI. Asymptotic properties of the Bernstein density copula for dependent data.
- 2008/46. Joe THARAKAN and Jean-Philippe TROPEANO. On the impact of labor market matching on regional disparities.
- 2008/47. Shin-Huei WANG and Cheng HSIAO. An easy test for two stationary long processes being uncorrelated via AR approximations.
- 2008/48. David DE LA CROIX. Adult longevity and economic take-off: from Malthus to Ben-Porath.
- 2008/49. David DE LA CROIX and Gregory PONTIERE. On the Golden Rule of capital accumulation under endogenous longevity.
- 2008/50. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ and Skerdilajda ZANAJ. Successive oligopolies and decreasing returns.
- 2008/51. Marie-Louise LEROUX, Pierre PESTIEAU and Grégory PONTIERE. Optimal linear taxation under endogenous longevity.
- 2008/52. Yuri YATSENKO, Raouf BOUCEKKINE and Natali HRITONENKO. Estimating the dynamics of R&D-based growth models.

### Books

- Y. POCHET and L. WOLSEY (eds.) (2006), *Production planning by mixed integer programming*. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- P. PESTIEAU (ed.) (2006), *The welfare state in the European Union: economic and social perspectives*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- H. TULKENS (ed.) (2006), *Public goods, environmental externalities and fiscal competition*. New York, Springer-Verlag.
- V. GINSBURGH and D. THROSBY (eds.) (2006), *Handbook of the economics of art and culture*. Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- J. GABSZEWICZ (ed.) (2006), *La différenciation des produits*. Paris, La découverte.
- L. BAUWENS, W. POHLMEIER and D. VEREDAS (eds.) (2008), *High frequency financial econometrics: recent developments*. Heidelberg, Physica-Verlag.
- P. VAN HENTENRYCKE and L. WOLSEY (eds.) (2007), *Integration of AI and OR techniques in constraint programming for combinatorial optimization problems*. Berlin, Springer.

### CORE Lecture Series

- C. GOURIÉROUX and A. MONFORT (1995), *Simulation Based Econometric Methods*.
- A. RUBINSTEIN (1996), *Lectures on Modeling Bounded Rationality*.
- J. RENEGAR (1999), *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*.
- B.D. BERNHEIM and M.D. WHINSTON (1999), *Anticompetitive Exclusion and Foreclosure Through Vertical Agreements*.
- D. BIENSTOCK (2001), *Potential function methods for approximately solving linear programming problems: theory and practice*.
- R. AMIR (2002), *Supermodularity and complementarity in economics*.
- R. WEISMANTEL (2006), *Lectures on mixed nonlinear programming*.